ACADEMIC JOURNAL VOL.1.0- ISSUE 2

OXBRIDGE®

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

A COMMON GROUND FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY SCHOLARSHIP

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

0000-0000

ACADEMIC JOURNAL VOL.1.0- ISSUE 2

OXBRIDGE®

A COMMON GROUND FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY SCHOLARSHIP

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

Editorial Board (Primarily an Editorial Group)

Editor-in-Chief:

- Asst. Prof. Dr. Ferhat Atik-0009-0008-9089-9051
- Dize Sidal, MSc, Psychologist-0009-0002-8830-4975

Editorial Members:

- Assc. Prof. Dr. Khorshed Alam-0000-0002-5124-4895
- Asst. Prof. Dr. Chao-Fu Yang-0000-0003-0777-5514
- Spec. Dr. Reyhan Toyran, MD-0000-0002-3344-915X
- Dr. Mayra Rodríguez Ruiz-0000-0001-8953-4583
- Dr. Mehmet Selhanoglu, MD-0009-0006-2463-4755
- Dr. Beste Zakoglu, Economist-0009-0000-3448-2077
- Dr. Margareta Sandström-0000-0002-8707-5157
- Dr. Serpil Malkoc, Biochemist
- Sezi Sidal, LL.B.-0009-0004-4087-616X
- Okan Oktay, Anthropologist

Special Policies

Editorial Integrity and Ethical Standards: Oxbridge Publishing UK is committed to academic integrity, editorial independence, and transparency. All publishing activities are conducted in accordance with internationally recognized standards of scholarly publishing ethics.

Plagiarism and Research Misconduct: All submissions are assessed for plagiarism and ethical compliance. Data fabrication, data falsification, improper citation, duplicate publication, and self-plagiarism are strictly prohibited. Suspected misconduct is subject to editorial investigation and may result in rejection or retraction.

Authorship and Responsibility: Authorship is based on substantial academic and intellectual contribution. Gift authorship, ghost authorship, and any form of misrepresentation of contribution are not permitted. All listed authors share responsibility for the content of the publication.

Conflict of Interest: Authors, editors, and reviewers must disclose any potential conflicts of interest that could influence editorial decisions. Failure to disclose relevant conflicts may lead to suspension of the evaluation process.

Peer Review and Editorial Decision-Making: For peer-reviewed publications, editorial decisions are made independently and solely on academic merit. Decisions are not influenced by authors' institutional affiliation, academic status, nationality, or personal relationships.

Corrections, Retractions, and Editorial Notices: When significant errors or ethical issues are identified after publication, appropriate editorial actions—such as corrections, retractions, or editorial notices—are issued. These notices remain permanently linked to the original publication.

Permanent Access and Archiving Policy: Oxbridge Publishing UK ensures permanent access to all published content. Stable publication URLs are maintained, and redirection is applied in cases of technical or infrastructural change. Content is not removed; instead, archival integrity is preserved through editorial documentation.

Transparency and Accountability: All publication policies are publicly available. Complaints and appeals are handled by the editorial board in a documented and accountable manner. Oxbridge Publishing UK recognizes its responsibility to the academic community and upholds transparency throughout the publishing process.

OXBRIDGE® PUBLISHING UK International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

ALGORITHMIC COMMUNICATION IN THE DIGITAL AGE AND ORGANIZATIONAL SYNERGY: THE TRANSFORMATION OF DECISION-MAKING, CONSCIENCE, AND COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR

Dr. Beste Zakoğlu
Rauf Denktaş Üniversitesi
Faculty of Business
Business Administration
Lefkoşa, KKTC
beste.zakoglu@rdu.edu.tr
ORCID: 0009-0000-3448-2077

ABSTRACT

This conceptual study examines the complex relationship between algorithmic communication, organizational synergy, and collective behavior in the digital age. The rapid proliferation of digital platforms and algorithm-driven communication systems is fundamentally transforming traditional decision-making processes and behavioral dynamics within organizations. The study highlights how algorithmic mediation in communication can facilitate coordination while simultaneously obscuring individual responsibility and conscience, producing paradoxical effects on organizational synergy. Drawing on organizational behavior and communication theories, the research conceptually analyzes how digital tools influence collective decision-making, ethical awareness, and alignment of employee behavior. The study argues that while algorithmic communication can enhance efficiency and coordination, it may also reduce employees' autonomy and moral accountability, negatively affecting the quality of collaboration and collective behavior. Organizational synergy is examined not only as the outcome of coordinated interactions but also as a behavioral and psychological phenomenon shaped by communication patterns and collective dynamics. The proposed conceptual framework integrates insights from digital communication, behavioral ethics, and synergy theory to illustrate the dual role of algorithmic systems as enablers and constraints of organizational behavior. This study provides theoretical and practical contributions for researchers and practitioners seeking a holistic understanding of the interplay between digital communication, behavior, and organizational synergy in contemporary workplaces.Keywords: Digital communication, algorithms, organizational behavior, synergy, collective
behavior, conscience.

Keywords: digital communication, algorithms, organizational behavior, synergy, collective behavior, conscience.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past four decades, the world has undergone a profound transformation driven by technological advancement. Engineering has evolved beyond the production of physical artifacts into the integration of digital systems, data infrastructures, and global communication networks. As Manuel Castells argues, contemporary society is structured as a "network society" in which power and productivity are organized through interconnected nodes rather than isolated units (Castells, 2010). Within this system, inclusion depends not merely on capability but on the ability to connect.However, this transformation has not been experienced equally across all societies. While globalization is often framed as a universalizing force, it simultaneously produces zones of inclusion and exclusion. As Joseph Stiglitz emphasizes, globalization has frequently failed to deliver equitable participation, instead reinforcing asymmetries between those integrated into global systems and those structurally marginalized (Stiglitz, 2002).

The case of the Turkish Cypriot community illustrates this asymmetry. The challenges faced by engineers and firms in Northern Cyprus are not reducible to technical limitations. Rather, they reflect a condition in which actors possess the capacity to produce but lack full access to the systems through which production becomes visible, validated, and scalable.

This article conceptualizes this condition as structural exclusion through invisible barriers—constraints that do not necessarily prohibit action but limit the conditions under which action becomes globally meaningful.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: NETWORKS, POWER, AND STRUCTURAL EXCLUSION

Global systems operate through networks that selectively include and exclude actors. According to Castells (2010), the key feature of the network society is that "inclusion or exclusion from networks determines the fate of individuals, groups, and societies." This insight is critical: exclusion is not always explicit; it often takes the form of disconnection.

This perspective aligns with Saskia Sassen's analysis of global assemblages. Sassen (2006) argues that globalization produces highly selective spaces of inclusion, where certain actors gain access to global flows while others remain peripheral. These dynamics are not accidental but structurally embedded.

From a power perspective, Michel Foucault provides a crucial lens. Foucault (1980) conceptualizes power not as repression but as a productive force that shapes what is possible, visible, and legitimate. In this sense, power operates by structuring the field of action itself. In the case of Northern Cyprus, the issue is not prohibition but the limitation of possibilities.

Furthermore, Pierre Bourdieu's concept of symbolic power helps explain how structural exclusion becomes internalized. Bourdieu (1991) shows that power operates through recognition and legitimacy; actors who lack recognition within dominant systems are effectively marginalized, regardless of their actual capabilities.

Thus, structural exclusion can be defined as a condition in which:

- actors possess competence
- but lack systemic recognition and integration

This distinction shifts the analytical focus from internal deficiency to external constraint.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

3. GLOBAL INTEGRATION AND THE PROBLEM OF ACCESS

Participation in global systems requires more than production. It depends on infrastructure, recognition, and connectivity. As Mark Graham and William H. Dutton note, access to the internetand digital networks is unevenly distributed, and this unevenness shapes who can participate meaningfully in the global economy (Graham & Dutton, 2019).

In Northern Cyprus, these inequalities manifest in concrete ways:

- difficulties in institutional verification
- limited access to global financial systems
- constraints in logistics and direct trade
- barriers to participation in international platforms

These are not abstract issues; they directly affect the ability of firms and engineers to operate globally.

As a result, actors often rely on indirect mechanisms—intermediaries, third countries, and informal networks. This creates what can be described as detoured integration, where participation is possible but never fully direct.

4. ENGINEERING UNDER STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINT

Engineering practice in Northern Cyprus must be understood within this context of constrained integration. Engineers are not only solving technical problems but also navigating systemic limitations.

Despite these constraints, significant work continues to be produced. However, as Rob Kitchin emphasizes, in contemporary societies, visibility is increasingly tied to data and infrastructure (Kitchin, 2014). If production is not integrated into global data and information systems, it remains effectively invisible.

This creates a paradox:

- production exists
- but recognition does not

This invisibility distorts external perceptions and reinforces exclusion.

5. INTERNALIZATION AND SYMBOLIC EFFECTS

Structural exclusion does not remain external; it becomes internalized. When actors repeatedly encounter barriers, these barriers may be reinterpreted as personal or collective limitations. Bourdieu (1991) explains this process as symbolic domination, where external structures shape internal dispositions. In Northern Cyprus, expressions such as “we cannot compete” or “we lack capacity” reflect not objective reality but internalized structural conditions.

This internalization is one of the most powerful effects of invisible barriers, as it reproduces exclusion even in the absence of direct constraint.

6. INVISIBLE BARRIERS AS AN ONTOLOGICAL CONDITION**Invisible barriers are not merely** practical obstacles; they shape the conditions of existence within global systems. They determine:

- what can be recognized
- what can circulate

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

• what can scale
In this sense, they constitute an ontological condition.
As Martin Heidegger suggests, technology is not just a tool but a way of revealing the world (Heidegger, 1977). If access to technological systems is limited, then the very structure of what can be revealed—and therefore what can exist socially—is also limited.
Thus, the issue is not the absence of capabi

7. CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that the challenges faced by engineers and firms in Northern Cyprus are not rooted in a lack of competence but in structural exclusion from global systems.
Drawing on Castells, Foucault, Bourdieu, Sassen, and others, the analysis shows that invisible barriers operate through disconnection, lack of recognition, and limited access to infrastructures.
These barriers do not prevent production; they shape its visibility and scalability.
Despite these constraints, significant capacity exists. The problem is not the absence of potential, but the conditions under which that potential can be realized.
Ultimately, achieving meaningful participation in global systems requires not only technical development but structural inclusion.
Until such inclusion is realized, production will continue—but within boundaries that are not always visible, yet always operative.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and symbolic power. Harvard University Press. ISBN: 9780674516717
Castells, M. (2010). The rise of the network society (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell. ISBN: 9781405196864
Foucault, M. (1980). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977. Pantheon Books. ISBN: 9780394739540
Graham, M., & Dutton, W. H. (2019). Society and the Internet: How networks of information and communication are changing our lives (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. ISBN: 9780198843498Heidegger, M. (1977). The question concerning technology and other essays. Harper & Row. ISBN:
9780061319693
Kitchin, R. (2014). The data revolution: Big data, open data, data infrastructures and their consequences. Sage. ISBN: 9781473902510
Sassen, S. (2006). Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages. Princeton University Press. ISBN: 9780691138596
Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). Globalization and its discontents. W. W. Norton & Company. ISBN: 9780393324396
van Dijck, J. (2013). The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199970773.001.0001

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Today, applications in the field of organizational behavior are significantly developing through artificial intelligence systems (Robbins & Judge, 2024), and the discipline increasingly places the role of technology at the center while examining the attitudes and actions of individuals and groups within organizations. The rapid development of machine learning and algorithms, which form the basis of artificial intelligence, has created new opportunities in the execution of work processes and management functions (Jarrahi et al., 2021), transforming various aspects of work and leading to the emergence of algorithmic management.

With this transformation, management functions traditionally carried out by human managers have been automated, shifting toward systems that utilize data-driven algorithms. The development of algorithmic management practices supported by artificial intelligence and machine learning has affected the nature of work and employee–manager relationships (Kellogg et al., 2020), making it necessary to reinterpret traditional organizational behavior theories (Keegan & Meijerink, 2025).

The delegation of managerial functions to algorithms for evaluating and directing employees presents itself as a challenge to organizational behavior theories. Although traditional organizational behavior theories were developed in a human context, the involvement of non-human agents as managers requires the re-examination of concepts such as control, motivation, and leadership. This transformation reconstructs the nature of work, employee–manager relationships, and motivational processes on the axis of algorithmic management within the discipline of organizational behavior.

2.1. Algorithmic Management and Digital Taylorism

The rapid development of algorithms and artificial intelligence has transformed various aspects of work, leading to the emergence of algorithmic management. This transformation involves the use of data-driven algorithms to automate managerial functions traditionally performed by human managers. Software algorithms that perform managerial functions, along with the organizational tools supporting them, are referred to as “Algorithmic Management” (Lee et al., 2015).

With the concept of “Algorithmic Management” introduced by Lee et al. (2015), the role of these systems in ensuring the smooth functioning of organizations and directing employee behavior and practices has been emphasized. Technological developments have enabled the use of artificial intelligence systems that simultaneously learn work processes and solve problems. Today, algorithms have become capable of managing employees’ behaviors and actions instead of human managers.

On this basis, algorithmic management exhibits fundamental characteristics similar to the Taylorist management approach (Oral, 2024). Taylorism argues that human managers should systematicallymonitor the workforce to detect time loss and pursue efficiency. Digital Taylorism is a modern interpretation of this management style and represents a theoretical view of a new form of Taylorism emerging through digital technologies and innovations adopted in work organization (Park & Ryoo, 2023).

Scientific management, introduced by Frederick Taylor, focused on optimizing processes through task specialization and efficiency. Algorithmic management extends this further by using algorithms to automate decision-making and achieve efficiency beyond human capabilities. However, unlike scientific management based on human managers, algorithmic management delegates decision-making to machines, raising concerns about employee autonomy and ethical outcomes (Sfetcu, 2024).

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Algorithmic management, as an important manifestation of Digital Taylorism, typically assigns tasks, evaluates performance, and enforces organizational rules using algorithms with minimal human intervention (Möhlmann & Zalmanson, 2017). Evaluating algorithmic management within the framework of Digital Taylorism makes it possible to position these practices within the developmental process of organizational theories.

While algorithmic management provides organizations with the ability to monitor and control the workforce in the most efficient way, it simultaneously eliminates the more interpersonal and empathetic aspects of human management. For example, Jago (2019) found that an algorithmic decision is less preferred than the same decision made by a human due to perceived lower authenticity and ethical understanding.

Algorithmic applications operating without an organizational partner that advocates for individuals' needs and maintains a balanced working relationship may also cause individuals to lose their sense of trust and self-confidence (Duggan et al., 2020).

Digital Taylorism has begun to embed itself in work processes in many organizations with its characteristics of surveillance, control, and deskilling. Therefore, its effects on organizational communication processes must be understood by keeping humans at the center and focusing on the relational aspects of communication (Laapotti & Raappana, 2022).

2.2. Algorithmic Communication

Among the factors at the center of organizational communication are how individuals receive, interpret, and transmit messages, and how these messages affect their motivation. Existing communication tools and cultures continuously shape organizational communication (Ndlela, 2024).

Although it is widely accepted that the success of an organization depends on how effectively its members communicate, the emergence of advanced AI-supported digital communication technologies today has transformed not only organizational communication but also how communication is theoretically conceptualized. Organizational communication is a multidimensional dynamic process that ensures the internal integrity of the organization, directs employee behavior, and serves the realization of organizational goals (Demirel et al., 2011). Today, this process has been reduced in many organizations to one-way data transfer through algorithms.

The fundamental component of algorithmic work is the interaction between humans and algorithms. These interactions occur through a digital interface and are mediated by underlying algorithmic computations (Tarafdar et al., 2023).

The developments in digitalization and artificial intelligence technologies have led to radical transformations in organizational communication processes. As an important reflection of this transformation, "algorithmic communication" refers to the management of communication processes through algorithms, automated systems, and data-driven decision mechanisms.

Algorithmic communication is widely used especially in human resource management, performance evaluation, task allocation, and internal communication platforms. Notifications to employees, automated feedback systems, AI-supported chats, and data-driven reporting tools constitute examples of the algorithmization of internal communication. While these processes have the potential to increase organizational efficiency and accelerate decision-making, they also create effects on employees' perceptions (Kellogg et al., 2020).

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

In studies on algorithms in organizations, algorithmic management is mostly conceptualized as a tool for managers to control employees, thereby limiting employees' autonomy and value (Kellogg et al., 2020; Duggan et al., 2020). Employees are expected to respond to instructions delivered through systems, applications, or notification tools, while the nuances, context, and negotiation typically present in human communication may be largely ignored. Reducing communication to automated output weakens dialogue processes within organizations (Ruslan & Saleh, 2025). This situation aligns with Labor Process Theory, which suggests that managers seek innovative ways to control workers in order to extract value created by their labor (Braverman, 1998).

Labor Process Theory, significantly developed in Harry Braverman's Labor and Monopoly Capital (1974), provides a critical framework for understanding how management attempts to control the production process to maximize capital accumulation. In the context of algorithmic communication and Digital Taylorism, the theory explains mechanisms through which technology is used not only for efficiency but also for systematic deskilling and domination of the workforce (Yücesan-Özdemir, 2010). One of the most important areas of debate created by algorithmic communication in organizations is the issue of transparency and control. Limited knowledge about how algorithms function may lead to feelings of uncertainty, distrust, and alienation among employees (Pasquale, 2015). While algorithms make communication processes more systematic and faster, they may limit the interpretive and emotional role of the human element in communication (Trittin-Ulbrich et al., 2021). In this context, the main issue for organizations is to establish a balance between the efficiency provided by algorithmic communication and the empathy, participation, and meaning-making required by human communication.

2.3. Synergy and Collective Behavior

Synergy and collective behavior are two complementary concepts that are critical for organizations to achieve sustainable competitive advantage. Collective behavior focuses on examining individualsby considering the causes and consequences of differences in physiology, motivation, experience, goals, and other characteristics in the context of how individuals influence others and are influenced by others (Bak-Coleman, 2020).

Organizational synergy, summarized by the statement "the whole is greater than the sum of its parts," is largely based on the fluid exchange of information, mutual trust, and the collective construction of meaning. However, the rapid integration of algorithmic management tools—ranging from automated planning to real-time performance monitoring—has fundamentally altered the nature of organizational communication.

Digital platforms produce a collective output by combining dispersed individual actions through algorithmic rules. However, Bak-Coleman et al. (2021) emphasize that such algorithmic guidance makes collective behavior manipulable and may weaken critical thinking by increasing the risks of "herd behavior."

This phenomenon, referred to as "Digital Taylorism," transfers Frederick Winslow Taylor's principles of scientific management into the digital age, where every keystroke and interaction is measured, optimized, and controlled. Fundamentally, organizational communication is a core function of organizational existence and extends beyond mere information transfer to encompass functions ranging from managerial effectiveness to the self-realization of human capital (Cooren et al., 2011).

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Communication networks provide the structural connection that enables synergy, allowing organizations to achieve outcomes greater than the sum of individual efforts (Monge & Contractor, 2003). This dynamic interaction is not static; rather, it operates as a cyclical and constitutive process that continuously reconstructs the internal reality of the organization.

In algorithmic management practices, employees interact not with people but with a "system." In most cases, this system is less transparent, and employees have no information about the rules governing the algorithms (Möhlmann & Zalmanson, 2017). Compared to traditional management contexts, employees may feel that they are working not for an organization composed of people, but for an abstract "system."

Within organizations, the implementation of group or team work creates an expectation that it provides certain advantages compared to individuals working alone. These advantages are generally defined as "synergy" within teams. Motivational benefits are also expected due to competition among group members, encouragement and support from teammates, and social responsibility toward the group (Hertel, 2011).

A significant development in organizational synergy is the integration of algorithms or artificial intelligence not merely as tools but as team members. Achieving this synergy requires a specific ethical and operational framework. Raisch and Krakowski (2021) argue that true synergy is often hindered by "automation bias," where individuals overly trust algorithms, or "algorithm aversion," where they distrust them.

They emphasize that organizational synergy in the digital age depends on designing interfaces that enable "mutual learning," where algorithms learn from human context and humans learn from algorithmic patterns.Although human–AI synergy is a goal, Digital Taylorism often functions as a disruptor of social

synergy. By isolating tasks and measuring individual outputs down to the second in order to maximize individual efficiency, algorithmic management may eliminate the collective intelligence of employees. Duggan et al. (2020) state that while algorithmic management increases individual task speed, it reduces the relational capital necessary for complex problem-solving and trades long-term innovation synergy for short-term efficiency.

Möhlmann and Zalmanson (2017) found that when employees are treated like machines through algorithmic management, they respond using "human" reaction mechanisms. They showed that when their interactions do not support the organization, employees informally come together and express collective behavior in this way. This behavior is used not only to regain autonomy but also to satisfy the desire for social interaction in the absence of a social working environment.

2.4. Conscience and Responsibility

In the classical sense, conscience is an internal mechanism that enables individuals to distinguish between right and wrong through moral awareness. The reflection of traditional moral awareness in the digital world, referred to as "Digital Conscience," is based on the ethical use of technology and a sense of responsibility.

It aims for individuals and institutions to distinguish between right and wrong in their online actions, to consider the societal effects of technology, and to avoid ethical violations. This concept, which arises from the need to redefine moral responsibilities in the age of digitalization, has become an inevitable necessity today (Turan, 2024).

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

As the role of technology in decision-making processes increases, the concepts of individual responsibility and conscience become ambiguous and may bring new moral problems. For example, although the use of artificial intelligence in recruitment processes has become a routine procedure for many organizations, scholars draw attention to the ethical challenges inherent in standardized evaluations and potentially biased recommendations (Figueroa-Armijos et al., 2022).
Due to the rapid evaluation of large applicant pools in various fields, hiring decisions are delegated to AI systems. These decisions have the potential to change, shape, direct, and even fundamentally transform individuals' lives in both negative and positive ways. This dilemma raises the question of who is responsible for the outcomes of decisions made by artificial intelligence (Ndlela, 2024).

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND MODEL

This study proposes an interdisciplinary theoretical framework to explain the relationship between algorithmic communication, organizational synergy, and collective behavior. The theoretical approach aims to understand not only the structural but also the psychological and moral transformation of organizations in the digital age by integrating organizational communication theories, organizational behavior literature, and behavioral ethics studies.
In this context, conscience is addressed not as an individual moral trait but as a dynamic process activated under communicative and organizational conditions (Bauman, 1989; Ashforth & Anand, 2003).While the increasing dominance of algorithmic systems in organizational communication contributes to faster decision-making processes and increased coordination, it also produces outcomes such as the diffusion of responsibility, weakening of ethical reasoning, and mechanization of collective behavior (Zuboff, 2019; Beer, 2017).
The theoretical framework developed in this section aims to explain these contradictory effects through a holistic model.

3.1. Conceptual Model

The proposed conceptual model positions algorithmic communication as a central regulatory mechanism affecting the field of organizational behavior. The model is structured around four main components: algorithmic communication, organizational synergy, collective behavior, and conscience. These components are addressed not in a linear but in a reciprocal and cyclical relationship.
The starting point of the model is that organizational synergy is not only the result of technical coordination but also a psychological phenomenon shaped by employees' perceptions of responsibility, ethical awareness, and communication patterns (Salas et al., 2015).
Algorithmic communication produces a dual effect that both facilitates and constrains this process. On the one hand, it increases organizational alignment by regulating information flow; on the other hand, it narrows the space for individual judgment by automating decision processes (Gillespie, 2014; Orlikowski & Scott, 2016).
In this context, conscience is not treated as a fixed individual trait but as a process that is activated or suppressed depending on the nature of organizational communication. Communication conducted through algorithmic interfaces may reduce the visibility of conscience in management by transferring ethical evaluation to systemic outputs (Bauman, 1989; Floridi, 2016).

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

3.2. The Relationship Between Algorithmic Communication and Organizational Synergy

Algorithmic communication operates with a regulatory logic that prioritizes the speed, frequency, and measurability of communication within organizations. This logic defines synergy not through shared meaning-making and interactional depth, but through task simultaneity, output alignment, and performance optimization (Leonardi, 2018). While this contributes to a quantitative increase in organizational synergy, it may lead to the neglect of its qualitative dimensions.

The organizational behavior literature emphasizes that mutual trust, ethical consistency, and shared responsibility are critical for the sustainability of synergy (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Barnard, 1938). However, under the regime of algorithmic communication, these elements are transferred to systemic processes rather than interpersonal interactions. As a result, synergy becomes a product of mechanical alignment rather than collective consciousness.

This study approaches the effect of algorithmic communication on organizational synergy as a paradoxical relationship. While algorithmic systems provide efficiency and alignment in the shortterm, they may threaten the qualitative sustainability of synergy in the long term due to ethical erosion and the loss of responsibility (Ashforth & Anand, 2003; Zuboff, 2019).

3.3. Theoretical Hypotheses

In line with the theoretical framework developed in this study, the following theoretical hypotheses are proposed:

H1: As the intensity of algorithmic communication within the organization increases, the ethical and moral dimension of organizational synergy weakens. (Bauman, 1989; Floridi, 2016)

H2: In digitalized organizations, algorithmically mediated communication increases collective behavior while reducing the perception of individual responsibility. (Beer, 2017; Zuboff, 2019)

H3: Under the regime of algorithmic communication, organizational synergy strengthens in terms of quantitative performance indicators but weakens in terms of qualitative collaboration and collective meaning-making. (Leonardi, 2018; Orlikowski & Scott, 2016)

These hypotheses provide a holistic analytical ground that addresses the effects of algorithmic systems on organizational behavior not merely as a matter of technical efficiency but also as a process of ethical, psychological, and communicative transformation.

4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This section analyzes the relationship between algorithmic communication, organizational synergy, and collective behavior based on the theoretical framework developed in the study and discusses the resulting findings. Although the analysis is not based on empirical data, it aims to evaluate the explanatory power of the proposed model by presenting a holistic synthesis of existing theoretical and conceptual studies.

4.1. Literature-Based Analysis

The existing literature reveals that digitalization produces multi-layered effects on organizational communication and behavior. In particular, the widespread use of algorithm-based systems in organizations contributes to the acceleration of decision-making processes and the reduction of coordination costs (Castells, 2010; Leonardi, 2018).

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

However, the mediated and indirect nature of communication through these systems may weaken the ethical connection individuals establish with the consequences of their actions.
The behavioral ethics literature demonstrates that the diffusion of responsibility and the anonymization of decision processes weaken moral reasoning (Bauman, 1989; Ashforth & Anand, 2003). Algorithmic communication accelerates this process by allowing individuals to legitimize decisions as "requirements of the system." This situation creates a ground for the normalization of ethical deviations in organizations and the continuation of collective behavior without questioning.The organizational synergy literature emphasizes that sustainable collaboration is possible not only through structural alignment but also through trust, reciprocity, and ethical consistency (Barnard, 1938; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Salas et al., 2015). In this context, the literature indicates that efficiency gains provided by algorithmic systems may weaken the qualitative dimensions of synergy in the long term.

4.2. The Effect of Algorithmic Communication on Synergy

Algorithmic communication has become a fundamental regulatory mechanism that redefines synergy in organizations. Structuring communication based on speed, measurability, and performance indicators leads to evaluating synergy not through shared meaning-making but through output alignment and behavioral standardization (Gillespie, 2014; Orlikowski & Scott, 2016).
While this transformation provides increased coordination and efficiency in the short term, it may weaken the psychological and ethical dimensions of organizational synergy in the long term.
The increasing integration of algorithmic systems into decision-making processes renders employees' subjective contributions invisible and transforms synergy from conscious collaboration among individuals into an output of systemic coordination. As Pasquale (2015) emphasizes, algorithmic "black box" structures obscure how decisions are made, making the source of responsibility ambiguous. This situation produces a structural problem that erodes the ethical foundation of synergy.
The organizational behavior literature shows that sustainable synergy is possible not only through structural alignment but also through trust, psychological safety, and a sense of mutual responsibility (Barnard, 1938; Edmondson, 1999). However, under the regime of algorithmic communication, these elements are subordinated to system logic rather than human interaction, transforming synergy into a structure that is quantitatively measurable but qualitatively fragile.
As Zuboff (2019) notes, while algorithmic systems make behavior predictable and manageable, they also narrow individual agency and transfer ethical reasoning to systemic processes. In this context, algorithmic communication produces a paradoxical effect on organizational synergy: while performance increases, collective commitment and ethical continuity weaken.

4.3. Collective Behavior and Conscience in the Digital Age

In the digital age, collective behavior is increasingly shaped by algorithmic guidance, automated recommendation systems, and data-driven norms. This situation makes individuals' share of responsibility within collective actions ambiguous and weakens the regulatory role of conscience over behavior (Beer, 2017; Floridi, 2016).
Collective behavior is reproduced not through ethical reasoning but through systemic compliance and operational requirements.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Bauman's (1989) argument regarding the transfer of responsibility to institutional structures in modern organizations becomes even more profound in the context of algorithmic communication. As Mittelstadt et al. (2016) state, algorithmic decision systems distribute ethical responsibility andnarrow the intervention space of individual conscience. This makes it difficult for individuals to assume ownership of the moral consequences of organizational actions.

The collective behavior literature shows that ethical awareness and a sense of responsibility do not emerge spontaneously within collective structures but must be consciously supported by leadership, communication, and organizational norms (Hannah et al., 2011). Under the regime of algorithmic communication, these support mechanisms weaken, and collective behavior is shaped more by algorithmic compliance than by moral reasoning.

As emphasized by Fourcade and Healy (2017), digital classification and scoring systems not only measure individuals but also reproduce behavioral norms. In this context, conscience ceases to function as an individual ethical compass and remains overshadowed by conformity to system-defined norms. This study argues that conscience does not disappear in the digital age; rather, it is functionally suspended under conditions of algorithmic communication.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study conceptually examined how organizational communication, restructured through algorithmic systems in the digital age, transforms organizational synergy and collective behavior. The findings indicate that algorithmic communication is not only a tool that increases coordination and efficiency in organizations, but also produces transformative—and in some cases erosive—effects on individual responsibility, ethical reasoning, and conscience.

This situation demonstrates that organizational synergy should be addressed not merely as a technical output but as a multi-layered phenomenon that includes psychological, communicative, and moral dimensions.

The study argues that the effects of algorithmic communication on organizational behavior are not linear and unidirectional; rather, they exhibit a contradictory and paradoxical structure. While algorithmic systems facilitate collaboration on the one hand, they may transform collective behavior into a mechanical alignment practice detached from ethical evaluation on the other. In this context, the findings suggest that the question of whether digitalization produces "more synergy" in organizations should be evaluated not only through performance indicators but also through the lens of conscience and responsibility.

5.1. Theoretical Contributions

The most important theoretical contribution of this study is that it addresses the relationship between algorithmic communication, organizational synergy, and collective behavior within a holistic framework through the concept of conscience. While algorithmic systems in the existing literature are mostly discussed in terms of efficiency, control, and governance (Beer, 2017; Zuboff, 2019), this study fills an important conceptual gap by placing the ethical and behavioral dimensions of organizational synergy at the center.

The study redefines conscience not as a fixed and individual moral trait but as a dynamic process that is activated or suppressed by organizational communication forms and decision-making processes.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

This approach updates Bauman's (1989) critique regarding the transfer of ethicalresponsibility to institutional structures by situating it within the context of digital organizations. It also challenges approaches that explain organizational synergy solely through structural alignment and output increase by emphasizing the psychological and behavioral sustainability of synergy (Salas et al., 2015).

In this respect, the study questions approaches in the digital organization literature that treat algorithmic communication as a "neutral tool" and makes visible the ethical consequences of communicative mediation.

5.2. Practical Contributions

From a practical perspective, this study offers important implications for organizations. Digitalization and algorithmic communication systems are often legitimized through advantages such as speed, efficiency, and cost reduction. However, the findings show that the design and use of these systems directly affect the quality of organizational synergy.

Systems that obscure individual responsibility and excessively automate decision processes may weaken the quality of collaboration and collective commitment in the long term. Therefore, organizations need to evaluate algorithmic communication systems not only as performance-enhancing tools but also as structures that produce ethical and behavioral consequences.

Transparent decision-making mechanisms, hybrid models that do not exclude human oversight, and communication channels that support employees' ethical reasoning are critical for the sustainability of organizational synergy (Floridi, 2016; Orlikowski & Scott, 2016).

The study also points out to managers and policymakers the importance of producing "more meaningful communication" rather than merely "more data" in digital transformation processes.

5.3. Limitations and Future Research

This study has a conceptual nature and is not supported by empirical data. This constitutes a limitation in terms of the generalizability of the proposed theoretical model. Future studies may test the hypotheses developed in this research using quantitative methods and examine the effects of algorithmic communication on organizational synergy and collective behavior comparatively across different sectors and organizational types.

In addition, how cultural context shapes the relationship between algorithmic communication and conscience emerges as a research area that has not yet been sufficiently addressed. How perceptions of responsibility, ethics, and collective behavior interact with algorithmic systems in different cultural structures presents an important research agenda for future studies.

Furthermore, with the increasing prevalence of AI-supported decision systems, the question of how organizational conscience can be constructed at an institutional level will constitute a critical area of discussion for future research.

REFERENCES

Ashforth, B. E., & Anand, V. (2003). The normalization of corruption in organizations. Research in Organizational Behavior, 25, 1–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25001-2

Ashkanasy, N., & Dorris, A. (2017). Organizational behavior. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.001.0001

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Bak-Coleman, J. B., Alfano, M., Barfuss, W., Bergstrom, C. T., Centeno, M. A., Couzin, I. D., … Weber, E. U. (2021). Stewardship of global collective behavior. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118(27), e2025764118.
Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Harvard University Press.
Bauman, Z. (1989). Modernity and the Holocaust. Polity Press.
Beer, D. (2017). The social power of algorithms. Information, Communication & Society, 20(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1216147
Braverman, H. (1998). Labor and monopoly capital: The degradation of work in the twentieth century. NYU Press.
Castells, M. (2010). The rise of the network society (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
Cooren, F., Kuhn, T., Cornelissen, J. P., & Clark, T. (2011). Communication, organizing and organization: An overview and introduction to the special issue. Organization Studies, 32(9), 1149–1170.
Demirel, Y., Seçkin, Z., & Özçınar, M. F. (2011). A study on the relationship between organizational communication and organizational citizenship behavior. Çukurova University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 20(2), 33–47.
Duggan, J., Sherman, U., Carbery, R., & McDonnell, A. (2020). Algorithmic management and app-work in the gig economy: A research agenda for employment relations and HRM. Human Resource Management Journal, 30(1), 114–132.
Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999
Figueroa-Armijos, M., Clark, B. B., & da Motta Veiga, S. P. (2023). Ethical perceptions of AI in hiring and organizational trust: The role of performance expectancy and social influence. Journal of Business Ethics, 186(1), 179–197.
Floridi, L. (2016). Faultless responsibility: On the nature and allocation of moral responsibility for distributed moral actions. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, 374(2083), 20160112. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2016.0112
Fourcade, M., & Healy, K. (2017). Seeing like a market. Socio-Economic Review, 15(1), 9–29. https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mww033
Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie et al. (Eds.), Media technologies (pp. 167–194). MIT Press.
Griffin, R. W., & Moorhead, G. (2017). Organizational behavior: Managing people and organizations. Cengage Learning.
Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). Relationships between authentic leadership, moral courage, and ethical behavior. Business Ethics Quarterly, 21(4), 555–578. https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201121436
Hertel, G. (2011). Synergetic effects in working teams. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 26(3), 176–184.
Jago, A. S. (2019). Algorithms and authenticity. Academy of Management Discoveries, 5(1), 38–56.
Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. Business Horizons, 61(4), 577–586.
Jarrahi, M. H., Newlands, G., Lee, M. K., Wolf, C. T., Kinder, E., & Sutherland, W. (2021). Algorithmic management in a work context. Big Data & Society, 8(2), 20539517211020332.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). Wiley.
Keegan, A., & Meijerink, J. (2025). Algorithmic management in organizations? From edge case to center stage. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 12(1), 395–422.
Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. Academy of Management Annals, 14(1), 366–410.
Laapotti, T., & Raappana, M. (2022). Algorithms and organizing. Human Communication Research, 48(3), 491–515.
Lee, M. K., Kusbit, D., Metsky, E., & Dabbish, L. (2015). Working with machines: The impact of algorithmic and data-driven management on human workers. In Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1603–1612).
Leonardi, P. M. (2018). Social media and the development of shared cognition. Organization Science, 29(4), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2017.1206
Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms. Big Data & Society, 3(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679
Monge, P. R., & Contractor, N. S. (2003). Theories of communication networks. Oxford University Press.
Möhlmann, M., & Zalmanson, L. (2017). Hands on the wheel: Navigating algorithmic management and Uber drivers' autonomy. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS).
Ndlela, M. N. (Ed.). (2024). Organizational communication in the digital era. Springer Nature.
Oral, T. (2024). Algorithmic management and unions in digital labor platforms. Journal of Health Academics, 11(1), 170–180.
Orlikowski, W. J., & Scott, S. V. (2016). The algorithm and the crowd. MIS Quarterly, 40(4), 1–22.
Pasquale, F. (2015). The black box society. Harvard University Press.
Park, S., & Ryoo, S. (2023). How does algorithm control affect platform workers' responses? Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 18(1), 273–288.
Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. Academy of Management Review, 46(1), 192–210.
Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. (2024). Organizational behavior (19th ed.). Pearson.
Ruslan, A., & Saleh, R. (2025). The algorithmic boss: Communication challenges in organizations using AI-driven management systems. Fast in Social Sciences, 1(1), 90–100.
Salas, E., Reyes, D. L., & McDaniel, S. H. (2015). The science of teamwork. American Psychologist, 70(6), 593–600. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039874
Sfetcu, L. (2024). Algorithmic management: Theoretical perspectives and implications for organizational development. Technium Social Sciences Journal, 66, 389.
Tarafdar, M., Page, X., & Marabelli, M. (2023). Algorithms as co-workers. Information Systems Journal, 33(2), 232–267.
Trittin-Ulbrich, H., Scherer, A. G., Munro, I., & Whelan, G. (2021). Exploring the dark and unexpected sides of digitalization. Organization, 28(1), 8–25.
Turan, T. (2024). Digital conscience: Ethics in the age of artificial intelligence. Yaz Publications.
Yücesan-Özdemir, G. (2010). Subcontracting as a despotic labor regime. Work and Society, 4(27), 35–50.
Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism. PublicAffairs.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Publication Ethics and Policies

Oxbridge Publishing UK, adheres to internationally recognized standards of publication ethics.

- Plagiarism Policy
All submissions undergo thorough plagiarism screening. Manuscripts with unethical similarity are rejected or returned for revision, ensuring originality and credibility.

- Conflict of Interest
Authors, editors, and reviewers must disclose any potential conflicts of interest to ensure transparency and maintain the integrity and credibility of the publication process.

- Corrections and Retractions
In cases of significant error or ethical violation, corrections or retraction notices are published and permanently linked to the original publication.

- Permanent Access Policy
Published works are maintained with stable URLs. Content removal is avoided; instead, editorial notices are issued where necessary.

Our Promise

Our publishing company is dedicated to supporting high-quality, original, and ethical scholarly work through the publication of academic journals and scholarly e-books. All publications are developed and released in accordance with internationally recognized academic publishing standards.
Our editorial processes are built on rigorous peer review, plagiarism screening, conflict of interest disclosure, and a strong commitment to academic integrity. Each published work is supported by clear and structured metadata, hosted on stable landing pages, and maintained with a long-term commitment to accessibility and preservation.

The reliability, traceability, and sustainability of scholarly content lie at the core of our publishing philosophy. We aim to ensure that every work we publish contributes lasting value to the global scholarly communication ecosystem through visibility, citability, and enduring academic relevance.

Contact

Email: info@oxbridgepublishinguk.com
Office: 2 dickens road Coventry cv6 2jt - United Kingdom
Message Center: https://bit.ly/44Pms6e
Web: www.oxbridgepublishinguk.com
Editor-in-chief: Asst. Prof. Dr. Ferhat Atik - ferhatatik@me.com

GOV.UK
We are an inclusive workplace. Please email us about any adjustments you may need.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

ACADEMIC JOURNAL VOL.1.0- ISSUE 2

OXBRIDGE®

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

A COMMON GROUND FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY SCHOLARSHIP

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

0000-0000